



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/985,924	11/06/2001	Masahiro Shiotani	086142-0493	4564
22428 75	90 08/09/2005		EXAM	INER
FOLEY AND LARDNER			RIVERA, WILLIAM ARAUZ	
SUITE 500 3000 K STREE	TNW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			3654	
			DATE MAILED: 08/09/2003	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/985,924	SHIOTANI ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		William A. Rivera	3654	
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
THE - Extended - If the - If NO - Faile Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR IT MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI sendous at time may be available unter the proteins of 37 or \$1.00 kg. MONTH'S from the mailing date of this communication period for reply is appelled above is less than thirty (30) 4300 communication of the communi	ION.  FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a indicate the statutory minimum of thir period will exply a will expire SIX (6) MoX statute, cause the application to become Af	reply be timely filed  ty (30) days will be considered timely.  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)[2]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	20 May 2005		
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.			
,	Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice un	lowance except for formal mat		
Disposit	tion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-15 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1.3.5-9 and 11-15 is/are rejected Claim(s) 2 and 10 is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction are subject to res	hdrawn from consideration.		
Applicat	tion Papers		•	
	The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.		
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection t	o the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the compared to be the control of the cont			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority docu Copies of the certified copies of the priority docu Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B See the attached detailed Office action fo	ments have been received. ments have been received in A e priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No I received in this National Stage	
Attachmer	nt(s)			
1) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) 🔲 Notic	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S	B/08) 5) Notice of i	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) ☐ Other:		

Application/Control Number: 09/985,924

Art Unit: 3654

## DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior at are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,899,399) in view of Schultz (U.S. Patent No. 2,586,099) and Ono et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,877).

With respect to Claims 1, 3, 5-9, and 11-15, Brown et al, teach a seat belt retractor comprising a spool 114 held in a frame; a bearing 102 attached to a portion of said spool held by said frame; a clutch mechanism 270; a pretensioner 280. Brown et al teach all the elements of the retractor except for the spool being made of a light alloy and a bearing made of steel. Schultz, Figure 1, teaches a bearing made of steel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Brown et al with a bearing made of steel, as taught by Schultz, for the purpose of protecting the surface of the spool. Ono et al, Figure 1, teach a spool 3 made of a light alloy. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Brown et al with a spool made of a light alloy, as taught by Ono et al, for the purpose of minimizing the weight of the retractor.

Application/Control Number: 09/985,924

Art Unit: 3654

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 20, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). The test for obviousness is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. Moreover, in evaluating such references it is proper to take into account not only the specific teachings of the references but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom and skill, rather than the converse, is presumed on the part of those of ordinary skill in the art.

Application/Control Number: 09/985,924

Art Unit: 3654

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William A. Rivera whose telephone number is 571-272-6953. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday - 7:30 to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on 571-272-6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free),

WILLIAM A. RIVERA PRIMARY EXAMINER

August 5, 2005